arXiv:1212.6732v1 [q-fin.RM] 30 Dec 2012

A Fourier Approach to the Computation of CV@R and Optimized Certainty Equivalents

Samuel Drapeau* Michael Kupper† Antonis Papapantoleon‡

January 1, 2013

We consider the class of risk measures associated with optimized certainty equivalents. This class includes several popular examples, such as CV@R and the entropic risk measure. We develop numerical schemes for the computation of such risk measures using Fourier transform methods. This leads to a very competitive method for the calculation of CV@R in particular, which is comparable in computational time to the calculation of V@R.

Introduction

The quantification of risk is more than ever a central issue in modern asset management. The increasing volume and complexity of financial instruments has raised the need for *coherent* but also *accurate* and *efficient* risk measurement methods. In the banking industry, a vast amount of positions and portfolios have to be assessed daily, which makes the computational speed of risk measurement methods a matter of paramount importance. Starting with Value at Risk (V@R), the goal of risk measures was to quantify the minimal amount of capital required in order to recover from unexpected large losses. V@R became very popular – see also the Basel II capital requirements – and is nowadays a standard instrument in the industry mainly for two reasons. First, it has an apparently obvious financial interpretation: it is the minimum amount of capital to be added to a position so as to push the probability of losses below a given level. Second, it has an easy and fast implementation: given a portfolio distribution, it simply accounts for the computation of the quantile of this distribution at a given level. However, V@R has a very serious deficiency, namely, it does not fulfill the basic property of diversification one should expect from a risk quantification instrument. Indeed, it may well happen that V@R delivers a lower risk for a portfolio concentrated in a single asset rather than one diversified into several assets.

In order to overcome this drawback, Artzner et al. [1] introduced an axiomatic approach to coherent risk measures inciting diversification. An important example of such a risk measure is the Conditional Value at Risk (CV@R), which is strongly related to the Average Value at Risk (AV@R) and the Expected Shortfall. The seminal paper on coherent risk measures [1] was later generalised to monetary convex risk

---

[*] drapeau@math.hu-berlin.de; Humboldt University Berlin, Unter den Linden 6, D-10099 Berlin, Germany. Financial support from MATHEON project E.11 is gratefully acknowledged.

[†] kupper@math.hu-berlin.de; Humboldt University Berlin, Unter den Linden 6, D-10099 Berlin, Germany.

[‡] papapan@math.tu-berlin.de; Institute of Mathematics, TU Berlin, Straße des 17. Juni 136, 10623 Berlin, Germany. Financial support from MATHEON project E.13 is gratefully acknowledged.

measures by Föllmer and Schied [16] and Frittelli and Rosazza Gianin [18], providing new examples, the most prominent of which is the entropic risk measure. This new class of risk measures attracted increasing attention from the financial industry as examples and numerical methods were studied, see, for example, Rockafellar and Uryasev [20], Dunkel and Weber [13] and Bardou et al. [2].

Compared to V@R though, coherent and convex risk measures are often more difficult to implement and costly in terms of computational time. Taking the example of CV@R, rather than looking for the quantile of the distribution at one level, it accounts for an integration of the quantile function over an interval, increasing thereby the numerical complexity.

The goal of this paper is to focus on a class of risk measures – the *optimized certainty equivalents* – introduced by Ben-Tal and Teboulle [4, 3], and use *Fourier methods* to compute them efficiently. The first reason for the choice of this class is that it entails most of the classical examples – CV@R, entropic risk measure, and monotone Mean-Variance among others. The second reason is that due to its nice smoothness properties it provides a fairly easy scheme for computation which can be resumed in the following two steps:

- Solve an allocation problem by use of a one dimensional root finding method;
- Based on this optimal allocation, compute an expectation.

Given these two steps and the explicit analytical formulas related to them, we make use of Fourier transform methods in order to compute these risk measures efficiently. Transform methods have been introduced to mathematical finance for option pricing, see Carr and Madan [5] and Raible [19] for instance, and have proved a very efficient tool when the Fourier transform of the underlying probability distribution is known. This is the case, in particular, for infinitely divisible distributions (i.e. Lévy models) and affine processes. In the context of risk measurement, the application of transform methods has been largely unexplored. For this class of risk measures, they turn out to be a very efficient tool for computations as well. In particular, the calculation of CV@R using Fourier methods has similar computational complexity as the computation of V@R, thus both risk measures can be computed in almost the same amount of time. This should be a further argument supporting the use of CV@R in practical applications.

This paper is organized as follows: in section 1 we discuss optimized certainty equivalents and their connections to risk measures. In section 2, we discuss the computation of optimized certainty equivalents using Fourier methods, and deterministic root-finding algorithms. We concentrate on the entropic risk measure, conditional value at risk and polynomial risk measures.

1 Optimized Certainty Equivalent

Let $(\Omega, \mathscr{F}, P)$ be a probability space. By L^0 we denote the set of random variables identified when they coincide P-almost surely. By L^p we denote the set of those random variables in L^0 with finite p-norm.

Definition 1.1. A function $l : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ is called a *loss function* if

(i) l is increasing and convex;

(ii) $l(0) = 0$ and $1 \in \partial l(0)$;

(iii) $l(x) \geq bx + c$ and $l(x) \geq b'x + c'$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$ for $b > 1 > b'$ and $c, c' \leq 0$.

By l^* we denote the convex conjugate of l, that is, $l^*(y) = \sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}}\{xy - l(x)\}$.

Let $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^+ \to \mathbb{R}^+$ be a convex function such that $\varphi(0) = 0$ and $\varphi(x) \geq l(x)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^+$. In particular, φ is a Young function and we denote by $\varphi^*(y) = \sup_{x\geq 0}\{xy - \varphi(x)\}$ its convex conjugate. Following [9, 8], we define the Orlicz heart

$$\mathcal{X}_\varphi := \left\{X \in L^0 : E\left[\varphi(c\,|X|)\right] < +\infty \text{ for all } c > 0\right\} \tag{1.1}$$

which is for the P-almost sure ordering and the φ-Luxembourg norm

$$\|X\|_\varphi := \inf\left\{a > 0 : E\left[\varphi\left(\frac{|X|}{a}\right)\right] \leq 1\right\} \tag{1.2}$$

a Banach lattice. The norm dual of $\mathcal{X}_\varphi$ is the Orlicz space

$$\mathcal{X}_\varphi^* := \left\{Y \in L^0 : E\left[\varphi^*(c\,|Y|)\right] < +\infty \text{ for some } c > 0\right\} \tag{1.3}$$

with the Orlicz norm

$$\|Y\|_\varphi^* := \sup\left\{E[YX] : \|X\|_\varphi \leq 1\right\}, \tag{1.4}$$

which is equivalent to the Luxembourg norm $\|\cdot\|_{\varphi^*}$. Since $\varphi(x) \geq l(x) \geq x$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^+$, it follows that $\mathcal{X}_\varphi \subseteq L^1$.

We denote with $\mathcal{M}_{1,\varphi^*}(P)$ the set of those probability measures on $\mathscr{F}$ which are absolutely continuous wit h respect to P and whose densities are in $\mathcal{X}_\varphi^*$. We consider risk measures in the following sense.

Definition 1.2. A *risk measure* is a function $\rho : \mathcal{X}_\varphi \to [-\infty, +\infty]$ which is

(i) quasi-convex: $\rho(\lambda X + (1-\lambda)Y) \leq \max\{\rho(X), \rho(Y)\}$ for all $X, Y \in \mathcal{X}_\varphi$ and $\lambda \in]0,1[$;

(ii) monotone: $\rho(X) \geq \rho(Y)$, whenever $X \leq Y$ for $X, Y \in \mathcal{X}_\varphi$.

A risk measure is called *monetary* if it is

(iii) cash additive: $\rho(X + m) = \rho(X) - m$ for all $m \in \mathbb{R}$ and all $X \in \mathcal{X}_\varphi$.

It is known that any monetary risk measure is automatically convex, see [11, 18, 7, 12] and the references therein. Monetary risk measures were introduced by Artzner et al. [1] and extended to the convex case by Föllmer and Schied [16] and Frittelli and Rosazza Gianin [18].

Given a loss function l, we define the Optimized Certainty Equivalent (OCE) introduced by Ben-Tal and Teboulle [3, 4] – to which we refer for further interpretation – as follows

$$\rho(X) := \inf_{\eta\in\mathbb{R}}\left\{E\left[l\left(\eta - X\right)\right] - \eta\right\} = \inf_{\eta\in\mathbb{R}} S_l\left(\eta, X\right), \quad X \in \mathcal{X}_\varphi. \tag{1.5}$$

whereby

$$S_l\left(\eta, X\right) := E\left[l\left(\eta - X\right)\right] - \eta, \quad \eta \in \mathbb{R} \text{ and } X \in \mathcal{X}_\varphi. \tag{1.6}$$

The following proposition is known, up to minor differences in the assumptions. See [4, 6] for the case $\mathcal{X}_\varphi = L^\infty$, [10] for the case where l is differentiable, and [9] for the computation of the dual representation in the general case. For the sake of readability, we provide a short proof based on results in [8].

Proposition 1.3. *Given a loss function* l*, the Optimized Certainty Equivalent is a lower semicontinuous cash additive risk measure taking values in* $\mathbb{R}$*. Furthermore, for any* $X \in \mathcal{X}_\varphi$*, there exists an optimal allocation* $\eta^* := \eta^*(X) \in \mathbb{R}$ *such that*

$$\rho\left(X\right) := E\left[l\left(\eta^* - X\right)\right] - \eta^* \tag{1.7}$$

and this optimal allocation η^* *belongs to* $[\operatorname{ess\,inf} X, \operatorname{ess\,sup} X]$ *and satisfies*

$$E\left[l'_-\left(\eta^* - X\right)\right] \leq 1 \leq E\left[l'_+\left(\eta^* - X\right)\right] \tag{1.8}$$

where l'_- *and* l'_+ *denote the left- and right-hand derivatives of* l*, respectively.*

Finally, it has the representation

$$\rho(X) = \max_{Q \in \mathcal{M}_{1,\varphi^*}(P)} \left\{ E_Q\left[-X\right] - E_P\left[l^*\left(\frac{dQ}{dP}\right)\right]\right\}, \quad X \in \mathcal{X}. \tag{1.9}$$

If l *is differentiable, this supremum is attained for* $Q^* \in \mathcal{M}_{1,\varphi}(P)$ *where the density is given by* $dQ^*/dP = l'\left(\eta^* - X\right)$*.*

Proof. Since $l(x) \geq x$ and $\mathcal{X}_\varphi \subseteq L^1$, it holds $S_l(\eta, X) \geq E[-X] > -\infty$, hence $\rho(X) > -\infty$. On the other hand, $S_l(0, X) \leq E[l(X^-)] \leq E[\varphi(|X|)] < +\infty$ since $X \in \mathcal{X}_\varphi$. Hence $\rho(X) < +\infty$.

Let us show that we have an optimal allocation determined by means of relation (1.8). Given $X \in \mathcal{X}_\varphi$, the function $\eta \mapsto S_l(\eta, X)$ is real valued and convex. Furthermore it holds

$$S_l\left(\eta, X\right) \geq E\left[-bX + b\eta + c\right] - \eta \geq (b-1)\eta - bE[X] + c$$

which goes to $+\infty$ as η goes to $+\infty$ since $b - 1 > 0$. A similar argumentation with b', c' implies that $S_l(\eta, X)$ goes to $+\infty$ as η goes to $-\infty$ since $b' - 1 < 0$. Hence, there exists a minimum $\eta^* \in \mathbb{R}$ such that (1.7) holds. A straightforward argumentation shows that $\eta^* \in [\operatorname{ess\,inf} X, \operatorname{ess\,sup} X]$. Finally, this optimal allocation fulfills the first order optimality criteria

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \nearrow 0} \frac{S_l(\eta^* + \varepsilon, X) - S_l(\eta, X)}{\varepsilon} \leq 0 \leq \lim_{\varepsilon \searrow 0} \frac{S_l(\eta^* + \varepsilon, X) - S_l(\eta, X)}{\varepsilon}$$

A straightforward application of Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem allows to interchange limits and expectations and get relation (1.8).

The fact that ρ is a cash additive risk measure is well-known, see [4]. The conditions of [8, Theorem 2.2] are fulfilled and it holds

$$\rho(X) = \max_{Q \in \mathcal{M}_{1,\varphi}(P)} \left\{E_Q[-X] - \alpha(Q)\right\}, \quad X \in \mathcal{X}_\varphi$$

where

$$\alpha(Q) := \sup_{X \in \mathcal{X}_\varphi} \left\{E_Q[-X] - \rho(X)\right\}, \quad Q \in \mathcal{M}_{1,\varphi^*}(P). \tag{1.10}$$

However, since $\mathcal{X}_\varphi$ is a decomposable space in the sense of [21, Definition 14.59] and l is a normal integrand, we can apply [21, Thereom 14.60] yielding

$$\begin{aligned}\alpha(Q) &= \sup_{X \in \mathcal{X}_\varphi, \eta \in \mathbb{R}} \left\{ E\left[-\frac{dQ}{dP}X\right] + \eta - E\left[l\left(-X + \eta\right)\right]\right\} \\ &= \sup_{\eta \in \mathbb{R}} \left\{ E\left[\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \left\{-\frac{dQ}{dP}x - l(-x + \eta)\right\}\right] + \eta\right\} = \sup_{\eta \in \mathbb{R}} \left\{ E\left[\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \left\{\frac{dQ}{dP}\left(x - \eta\right) - l(x)\right\}\right] + \eta\right\} \\ &= \sup_{\eta \in \mathbb{R}} \left\{ E\left[l^*\left(\frac{dQ}{dP}\right)\right] + \eta\left(1 - E\left[\frac{dQ}{dP}\right]\right)\right\} = E\left[l^*\left(\frac{dQ}{dP}\right)\right],\end{aligned}$$

which shows equation (1.9). As for the representation in terms of the optimal density, we refer to [10]. □

2 Numerical Computation of Optimized Certainty Equivalents

The aim in this section is to develop numerical methods for the computation of optimized certainty equivalents based on transform methods and deterministic root finding algorithms. In general, the computation of the optimal allocation η^* and the risk measure $\rho(X)$ in Proposition 1.3 can be performed in two steps:

Step 1: use a deterministic root finding algorithm to compute η^* in (1.8), combined with transform methods for the computation of the expectations;

Step 2: use transform methods once more to compute the expectation $E[l(\eta^* - X)]$ and thus $\rho(X)$.

The terminus "transform method" indicates any method that uses the characteristic or moment generating function of the random variable X for the computation of expectations of functions of X. This includes the Fourier transform method of Carr and Madan [5], the Laplace transform method of Raible [19] and the cosine series expansion of Fang and Oosterlee [15]. Similarly, the term "root finding algorithm" refers to any method for determining the root of a function; e.g. bisection, secant or Newton's method, cf. Stoer and Bulirsch [23] for an overview.

We start by describing the first main tool used in this section, which is the Fourier representation of expected values of functions of random variables. This result, which generalizes the classical Parseval formula, dates back to the work on transform methods for option pricing and is particularly suitable for models with known characteristic function, e.g. Lévy and affine models. We will follow the work of Eberlein et al. [14] closely, while we refer to Schmelzle [22] for a comprehensive overview and numerous references.

Let l be a loss function as described in the previous section and denote by l_R the *dampened* loss function, defined by $l_R(x) := \mathrm{e}^{-Rx} l(x)$, for $R \in \mathbb{R}$. Moreover, let $\widehat{f}$ denote the Fourier transform of a function f, i.e. $\widehat{f}(u) = \int \mathrm{e}^{iux} f(x)dx$, and M_X the (extended) moment generating function of X, i.e. $M_X(u) = E[\mathrm{e}^{uX}]$, for suitable $u \in \mathbb{C}$. By L^1, resp. L^1_{bc}, we denote the set of measurable functions on the real line which are integrable, resp. bounded, continuous and integrable, with respect to the Lebesgue measure. We also denote by S° the interior of a set S and by $\Im(z)$ the imaginary part of the complex number z.

Theorem 2.1. *Let $X \in L^0$ and define*

$$\mathcal{I} := \{R \in \mathbb{R} : M_X(R) < \infty\} \tag{2.1}$$

$$\mathcal{J} := \left\{R \in \mathbb{R} : l_R \in L^1_{bc} \text{ and } \widehat{l}_R \in L^1\right\}. \tag{2.2}$$

Under the assumption

(A-I) $\mathcal{I} \cap \mathcal{J} \neq \emptyset$,

the following representation holds true:

$$E\big[l(\eta - X)\big] = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \mathrm{e}^{(R-iu)\eta} M_X(iu - R) \widehat{l}(u + iR) du. \tag{2.3}$$

Proof. See [14, Thm. 2.2]. □

Remark 2.2. Consider a random variable X such that $0 \in \mathcal{I}^\circ$ and a loss function l that has polynomial growth. Then, it follows directly that $X \in \mathcal{X}_\varphi$. ◆

2.1 Entropic Risk Measure

We start by considering the entropic loss function

$$l(x) = \frac{\mathrm{e}^{\gamma x} - 1}{\gamma}$$

with $\gamma > 0$. The derivative and the conjugate function are

$$l'(x) = \mathrm{e}^{\gamma x} \quad \text{and} \quad l^*(y) = \frac{y \ln(y)}{\gamma} - \frac{y-1}{\gamma}.$$

In this case, the optimal allocation η^* and the risk measure $\rho(X)$ can be computed explicitly and are provided by

$$\begin{aligned} \eta^* &= -\frac{1}{\gamma} \ln\left(E\left[\mathrm{e}^{-\gamma X}\right]\right), \\ \rho(X) &= -\eta^* = \frac{1}{\gamma} \ln\left(E\left[\mathrm{e}^{-\gamma X}\right]\right) \\ &= \sup_{Q \in \mathcal{M}_{1,\varphi^*}(P)} \left\{ E_Q\left[-X\right] - E_Q\left[\ln\left(\frac{dQ}{dP}\right)\right]\right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that in Lévy and affine models the quantity $E[\mathrm{e}^{-\gamma X}]$ is known explicitly in terms of the Lévy–Khintchine formula or the affine transform formula, hence also η^* and $\rho(X)$ are computed explicitly.

2.2 Conditional Value at Risk

The most interesting example from the point of view of practical applications is Conditional Value at Risk, also known as Average Value at Risk or Expected Shortfall. These notions coincide if X has a continuous distribution, see Föllmer and Schied [17, Corollary 4.49]. The loss function in this case is

$$l(x) = -\gamma_1 x^- + \gamma_2 x^+ = \begin{cases} \gamma_1 x & \text{if } x \leq 0 \\ \gamma_2 x & \text{if } x > 0, \end{cases} \tag{2.4}$$

with $\gamma_2 > 1 > \gamma_1 \geq 0$. The left-hand derivative equals

$$l'_-(x) = \gamma_1 1_{\{x \leq 0\}} + \gamma_2 1_{\{x > 0\}}, \tag{2.5}$$

while the conjugate function is

$$l^*(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \gamma_2 \leq x \leq \gamma_1 \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise .} \end{cases} \tag{2.6}$$

In case $\gamma_1 = 0$, this corresponds to the standard CV@R with parameter $1/\gamma_2$; see e.g. Rockafellar and Uryasev [20].

The optimal allocation can be computed explicitly, in terms of the quantile function q_X of X, and is provided by

$$\eta^* = q_X\left(\frac{1-\gamma_1}{\gamma_2 - \gamma_1}\right). \tag{2.7}$$

The following representation for this risk measure is also standard in the literature

$$\rho(X) = -\gamma_2 \int\limits_0^{\frac{1-\gamma_1}{\gamma_2-\gamma_1}} q_X(s)ds - \gamma_1 \int\limits_{\frac{1-\gamma_1}{\gamma_2-\gamma_1}}^{1} q_X(s)ds \tag{2.8}$$

$$= \sup_{Q\in\mathcal{M}_{1,\varphi^*}(P)} \left\{E_Q[-X] : \gamma_1 \le dQ/dP \le \gamma_2\right\}. \tag{2.9}$$

In particular, for the special case of CV@R with parameter $\lambda = 1/\gamma_2$, it holds that $\eta^* = q_X(\lambda)$ and

$$CV@R_\lambda(X) = -\frac{1}{\lambda}\int\limits_0^\lambda q_X(s)ds = \sup_{Q\in\mathcal{M}_{1,\varphi^*}(P)} \left\{E_Q[-X] : dQ/dP \le \frac{1}{\lambda}\right\} \tag{2.10}$$

The aim of the next result is to provide an alternative representation for $\rho(X)$, using transform methods.

Proposition 2.3. *Assume that the optimal allocation η^* is computed by* (2.7)*. Let $X \in L^1$ be a random variable such that $\mathcal{I} \neq \emptyset$ with $0 \in \mathcal{I}^\circ$. Then, ρ admits the following representation*

$$\rho(X) = \frac{\gamma_1}{2\pi}\int\limits_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{\mathrm{e}^{(R_1-iu)\eta^*}}{(u+iR_1)^2} M_X(iu-R_1)du - \frac{\gamma_2}{2\pi}\int\limits_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{\mathrm{e}^{(R_2-iu)\eta^*}}{(u+iR_2)^2} M_X(iu-R_2)du - \eta^*, \tag{2.11}$$

where $R_1 \in \mathcal{I}\cap(-\infty,0)$ and $R_2 \in \mathcal{I}\cap(0,+\infty)$. In particular, for CV@R we get

$$CV@R_\lambda(X) = \frac{1}{2\pi\lambda}\int\limits_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{\mathrm{e}^{(R-iu)\eta^*}}{(u+iR)^2} M_X(iu-R)du$$

where $\lambda = 1/\gamma_2$ and $R \in \mathcal{I}\cap(-\infty,0)$.

Proof. Since η^* is already computed using the first order condition (1.8) for the loss function (2.4), see (2.7), we will apply Theorem 2.1 directly to representation (1.7). We get

$$\begin{aligned}\rho(X) &= E\left[l(\eta^*-X)\right] - \eta^* = E\left[-\gamma_1(\eta^*-X)^- + \gamma_2(\eta^*-X)^+\right] - \eta^* \\ &= -\gamma_1 E\left[(X-\eta^*)^+\right] + \gamma_2 E\left[(\eta^*-X)^+\right] - \eta^* \\ &= -\frac{\gamma_1}{2\pi}\int\limits_{\mathbb{R}} \mathrm{e}^{(R_1-iu)\eta^*} M_X(iu-R_1)\widehat{l}_1(u+iR_1)du \\ &\quad + \frac{\gamma_2}{2\pi}\int\limits_{\mathbb{R}} \mathrm{e}^{(R_2-iu)\eta^*} M_X(iu-R_2)\widehat{l}_2(u+iR_2)du - \eta^*,\end{aligned} \tag{2.12}$$

for $R_1 \in \mathcal{I}\cap\mathcal{J}_1$, $R_2 \in \mathcal{I}\cap\mathcal{J}_2$, where we define the functions

$$l_1(x) = (-x)^+ \quad \text{and} \quad l_2(x) = (x)^+. \tag{2.13}$$

Now, we just have to compute the Fourier transforms of the functions l_1 and l_2 — which are reminiscent of the (payoff) functions corresponding to a put and a call option —, determine the sets $\mathcal{J}_1$ and $\mathcal{J}_2$ and show that the prerequisites of Theorem 2.1 are satisfied.

We have that, for $z \in \mathbb{C}$ with $\Im(z) \in (-\infty,0)$, the Fourier transform of l_1 is provided by

$$\widehat{l_1}(z) = \int\limits_{\mathbb{R}} \mathrm{e}^{izx}(-x)^+dx = -\int\limits_{-\infty}^{0} \mathrm{e}^{izx}xdx = -\frac{x}{iz}\mathrm{e}^{izx}\Big|_{-\infty}^{0} + \frac{1}{(iz)^2}\mathrm{e}^{izx}\Big|_{-\infty}^{0} = -\frac{1}{z^2}, \tag{2.14}$$

while for l_2 we get the same formula, that is

$$\widehat{l}_2(z) = -\frac{1}{z^2}, \tag{2.15}$$

where now $z \in \mathbb{C}$ with $\Im(z) \in (0, +\infty)$.

Let us turn our attention to the corresponding dampened payoff functions, i.e.

$$l_{1,R_1}(x) = \mathrm{e}^{-R_1 x}(-x)^+ \quad \text{and} \quad l_{2,R_2}(x) = \mathrm{e}^{-R_2 x}(x)^+. \tag{2.16}$$

Clearly, for $R_1 < 0$ and $R_2 > 0$, these functions are bounded and continuous, while from (2.14) it follows directly that $l_{1,R_1}, l_{2,R_2} \in L^1$. A direct computation shows that also $l_{1,R_1}, l_{2,R_2} \in L^2$. Indeed,

$$\|l_{1,R_1}\|^2_{L^2} = \int_{\mathbb{R}} |l_{1,R_1}(x)|^2 \, dx = \int_{-\infty}^{0} \mathrm{e}^{-2R_1 x} x^2 dx = \frac{1}{4R_1^3} < \infty, \tag{2.17}$$

while the computation for $l_{2,R}$ is completely analogous. We can also examine the weak derivatives of $l_{1,R}, l_{2,R}$; we have that

$$\partial l_{1,R_1}(x) = \begin{cases} \mathrm{e}^{-R_1 x}(R_1 x - 1) & \text{for } x > 0 \\ 0 & \text{for } x < 0 \end{cases} \tag{2.18}$$

and we can directly deduce that $\partial l_{1,R_1} \in L^2$, while the same is true for $\partial l_{2,R_2}$. Thus, we get that l_{1,R_1}, l_{2,R_2} belong to the Sobolev space

$$H^1(\mathbb{R}) = \big\{ g \in L^2 : \partial g \text{ exists and } \partial g \in L^2 \big\} \tag{2.19}$$

and using [14, Lem. 2.5] we can conclude that $\widehat{l}_{1,R_1}, \widehat{l}_{2,R_2}$ are integrable. Therefore, $\mathcal{J}_1 = (-\infty, 0)$ and $\mathcal{J}_2 = (0, +\infty)$.

Finally, since $0 \in \mathcal{I}^\circ$, we have that $\mathcal{I} \cap \mathcal{J}_1 \neq \emptyset$ and $\mathcal{I} \cap \mathcal{J}_2 \neq \emptyset$, hence assumption **(A-I)** is satisfied. The result now follows by substituting (2.14)–(2.15) into (2.12). □

Remark 2.4 (Numerical Efficiency). The Fourier representation (2.11) for the Conditional Value at Risk is numerically more efficient than the standard one in (2.8). Indeed, the latter requires to solve an optimization problem, i.e. the computation of the quantile q_X, for every grid point used in the numerical quadrature, while the former requires to solve *only one* optimization problem for the computation of η^*. Assume that the grid for the numerical integration has size N, the computational effort for the solution of the optimization problem is M_O, while the computational effort for the numerical integration is M_I, where typically $M_I \ll M_O$. Then, the total computation effort for the two methods compares as follows:

$$\mathrm{TCE(Fourier)} \cong M_O + M_I \quad \text{vs} \quad \mathrm{TCE(standard)} \cong N \cdot M_O + M_I. \tag{2.20}$$

This also reveals that the computation of CV@R is not significantly more time consuming that the computation of V@R, since the bulk of the computation is the optimization problem (i.e. quantile or V@R) and not the numerical integration. This should be an argument in favour of using CV@R in practical applications. ◆

2.3 Polynomial Loss Function

Next, we consider the polynomial loss function defined by

$$l(x) = \frac{\left([1+x]^+\right)^\gamma - 1}{\gamma} \tag{2.21}$$

for $\gamma \in \mathbb{N}$, $\gamma > 1$. The derivative equals

$$l'(x) = \left([1+x]^+\right)^{\gamma-1}, \tag{2.22}$$

and the conjugate function is provided by

$$l^*(y) = \begin{cases} \dfrac{(1-\gamma)y^{\frac{\gamma}{\gamma-1}} - \gamma y - 1}{\gamma}, & \text{for } y \geq 0 \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \tag{2.23}$$

In this case, neither the optimal allocation nor the OCE can be computed explicitly, and one has to resort to numerical methods for both. In particular, we will combine Fourier transform methods with deterministic root-finding algorithms.

Proposition 2.5. *Let $X \in L^\gamma$ be a random variable such that $0 \in \mathcal{I}^\circ$. The optimal allocation is determined numerically by the secant method, that is $\eta_k \longrightarrow \eta^*$ as $k \to \infty$, where*

$$\eta_{k+1} = \eta_k - f(\eta_k) \cdot \frac{\eta_k - \eta_{k-1}}{f(\eta_k) - f(\eta_{k-1})} \tag{2.24}$$

with

$$f(\eta_k) = \frac{(\gamma-1)!}{2\pi} \int\limits_{\mathbb{R}} M_X(iu - R) \frac{\mathrm{e}^{(iu-R)(1+\eta_k)}}{(iu-R)^\gamma} du - 1. \tag{2.25}$$

Once η^* is determined, the polynomial loss function risk measure admits the following representation

$$\rho(X) = \frac{(\gamma-1)!}{2\pi} \int\limits_{\mathbb{R}} M_X(iu - R) \frac{\mathrm{e}^{(iu-R)(1+\eta^*)}}{(iu-R)^{\gamma+1}} du - \frac{1}{\gamma} - \eta^*, \tag{2.26}$$

where $R \in \mathcal{I} \cap (-\infty, 0)$.

Proof. We start by computing the Fourier transform of the following function:

$$\ell(x) = [(a-x)^+]^n \tag{2.27}$$

for $a \in \mathbb{R}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Integrating by parts iteratively we get, for $z \in \mathbb{C}$ with $\Im(z) \in (-\infty, 0)$, that

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\ell}(x) &= \int\limits_{\mathbb{R}} \mathrm{e}^{izx} p(x) dx = \int\limits_{-\infty}^{a} \mathrm{e}^{izx} (a-x)^n dx \\ &= \underbrace{\frac{\mathrm{e}^{izx}}{iz}(a-x)^n \Big|_{-\infty}^{a}}_{=0} + \frac{n}{iz} \int\limits_{-\infty}^{a} \mathrm{e}^{izx} (a-x)^{n-1} dx \\ &= \ldots \\ &= \frac{n!}{(iz)^n} \int\limits_{-\infty}^{a} \mathrm{e}^{izx} dx = \frac{n!}{(iz)^{n+1}} \mathrm{e}^{iza}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.28}$$

Following the same argumentation as in the proof of Proposition 2.3, we can show that the dampened function ℓ_R belongs to L^1_{bc} and has an integrable Fourier transform for all $R \in (-\infty, 0)$. In other words, $\mathcal{J} = (-\infty, 0)$.

Now, consider the function

$$f(\eta) = E\left[\left((1+\eta-X)^+\right)^{\gamma-1}\right] - 1. \tag{2.29}$$

According to (1.8), the root of this function determines the optimal allocation corresponding to the polynomial loss function (2.21). This root can be determined by a standard root-finding algorithm, e.g. the secant method, which states that $\eta_k \longrightarrow \eta^*$ as $k \to \infty$, where

$$\eta_{k+1} = \eta_k - f(\eta_k) \cdot \frac{\eta_k - \eta_{k-1}}{f(\eta_k) - f(\eta_{k-1})}. \tag{2.30}$$

Applying Theorem 2.1 to (2.29), using (2.28) with $a = 1+\eta$ and $n = \gamma - 1$, and recalling that $\mathcal{I} \cap \mathcal{J} \neq \emptyset$ since $0 \in \mathcal{I}^\circ$, yields the representation (2.25).

Once the optimal allocation has been determined numerically, we just have to combine (1.7), (2.21), Theorem 2.1, and (2.29) with $a = 1 + \eta^*$ and $n = \gamma$, and direct computations yield representation (2.26) for the risk measure corresponding to the polynomial loss function. $\square$

References

[1] P. Artzner, F. Delbaen, J. M. Eber, and D. Heath. Coherent Measures of Risk. *Mathematical Finance*, 9:203–228, 1999.

[2] O. Bardou, N. Frikha, and G. Pagès. Computing VaR and CVaR using stochastic approximation and adaptive unconstrained importance sampling. *Monte Carlo Methods and Applications*, 15:173–210, 2009.

[3] A. Ben-Tal and M. Teboulle. Expected Utility, Penalty Functions and Duality in Stochastic Nonlinear Programming. *Management Science*, 32:1445–1466, 1986.

[4] A. Ben-Tal and M. Teboulle. An Old-New Concept Of Convex Risk Measures: The Optimized Certainty Equivalent. *Mathematical Finance*, 17:449–476, 2007.

[5] P. Carr and D. B. Madan. Option Valuation using the Fast Fourier Transform. *Journal of Compututational Finance*, 2(4):61–73, 1999.

[6] A. Cerny, F. Maccheroni, M. Marinacci, and A. Rustichini. On the Computation of Optimal Monotone Mean-Variance Portfolios via Truncated Quadratic Utility. *Journal of Mathematical Economics*, 48:386–395, 2012.

[7] S. Cerreia-Vioglio, F. Maccheroni, M. Marinacci, and L. Montrucchio. Risk Measures: Rationality and Diversification. *Mathematical Finance*, 21:743–774, 2011.

[8] P. Cheridito and T. Li. Dual Characterization of Properties of Risk Measures on Orlicz Hearts. *Mathematics and Financial Economics*, 2:29–55, 2008.

[9] P. Cheridito and T. Li. Risk Measures on Orlicz Hearts. *Mathematical Finance*, 19:189–214, 2009.

[10] A. S. Cherny and M. Kupper. Divergence Utilities. *Preprint*, 2007.

[11] F. Delbaen. *Coherent Utility Functions*. Pretoria Lecture Notes, 2003.

[12] S. Drapeau and M. Kupper. Risk Preferences and their Robust Representation. *forthcoming in Mathematics of Operations Research*, 2010.

[13] J. Dunkel and S. Weber. Stochastic root finding and efficient estimation of convex risk measures. *Oper. Res.*, 58:1505–1521, 2010.

[14] E. Eberlein, K. Glau, and A. Papapantoleon. Analysis of Fourier Transform Valuation Formulas and Applications. *Applied Mathematical Finance*, 17:211–240, 2010.

[15] F. Fang and C. W. Oosterlee. A novel pricing method for European options based on Fourier-cosine series expansions. *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing*, 31:826–848, 2008.

[16] H. Föllmer and A. Schied. Convex Measures of Risk and Trading Constraints. *Finance and Stochastics*, 6:429–447, 2002.

[17] H. Föllmer and A. Schied. *Stochastic Finance. An Introduction in Discrete Time*. de Gruyter Studies in Mathematics. Walter de Gruyter, Berlin, New York, 2 edition, 2004.

[18] M. Frittelli and E. Rosazza Gianin. Putting Order in Risk Measures. *Journal of Banking & Finance*, 26:1473–1486, July 2002.

[19] S. Raible. *Lévy Processes in Finance: Theory, Numerics, and Empirical Facts*. PhD thesis, Univ. Freiburg, 2000.

[20] R. T. Rockafellar and S. Uryasev. Optimization of Conditional Value-At-Risk. *Journal of Risk*, 2 (3):21–41, 2000.

[21] R. T. Rockafellar and R. J.-B. Wets. *Variational Analysis*. Springer, Berlin, New York, 1998.

[22] M. Schmelzle. Option Pricing Formulae using Fourier Transform: Theory and Application. Preprint, http://pfadintegral.com, 2010.

[23] J. Stoer and R. Bulirsch. *Introduction to Numerical Analysis*. Springer, 3rd edition, 2002.